



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OF THE

STUDY OF THE U.S. SUMMER/WINTER INSTITUTES

EVALUATION

Submitted to:

United States Department of State
(formerly the United States Information Agency)
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
Office of Policy and Evaluation

by
Kais E Systems, Inc.

February 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The evaluation of the [United States Summer Institutes](#) was conducted during October, 1998 through July, 1999. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine what effect, if any, that participation in Summer/Winter Institute programs may have had on scholars vis a vis changes in their behavior and activities in their home institutions, their local, state and/or national communities, and/or with regard to the international community. Romania was selected as the case study of alumni who participated in the Summer/Winter Institutes.

The data was collected using alumni surveys, individual interviews, focus groups, host institute telephone surveys, and program management interviews. Thirteen participants from Romania were selected to participate in the study. The study participants had attended a Summer or Winter Institute since 1990. Eight of the study participants were able to attend a group session in Bucharest on June 22, 1999. The study team interviewed the individuals who were able to come to Bucharest for the group session. Ten participants responded to the alumni survey for a response rate of 77%.

The alumni survey data provided strong support of the importance of the U.S. Studies Program in Romania.

1. Seventy percent of the respondents had been asked to conduct seminars, training sessions, or lectures outside their normal teaching activities.
2. Fifty percent of the survey respondents indicated that they had been promoted since their return from their summer institute.

3. Seventy-five percent of those promoted believed there is a direct correlation between their promotion and their participation in the Summer/Winter Institute.

A secondary finding of the study was a variation in the mean responses of the alumni and the host institute regarding abilities, skills, and qualifications of the participants. The participants believe that they are academically qualified to participate in the Summer/Winter Institute programs; however, they also indicated that they lack the computer and library research skills that are necessary to maximize their academic experience.

The host institute telephone survey responses did not yield the same results. The host institutes rated the participants less qualified and less prepared to meet the rigorous academic challenges of the institute. This belief held true with two exceptions: the host institutes rated the library research skills and the computer skills higher than the participants rated themselves. Further research may reveal that this is a result of the host institutes aggregating the skills of all Summer/Winter Institute participants, and therefore defining the variance between the host institute rating and the rating completed by the Romanian participant. There does appear to be some indication that the service provider (the host institute) and the customer (the participant) do not agree on the level of skills, interactions, qualifications, and services that currently exist or that are required to participate in a Summer/Winter Institute.

Without exception, the participants all indicated that the USIA/E/AES program is well known and well respected as an excellent opportunity for training in United States studies. The participants unanimously responded that they would recommend the program to their colleagues and that a valuable and long-term benefit of the Summer/Winter

Institute is their understanding of American values and society. There is no doubt that the Romanians who participated in the Summer/Winter Institutes have benefited greatly from their experience. They share these experiences with their colleagues, their students, their friends, and their communities.

Has the Study of the United States Program created linkages and change in Romania? As a result of this evaluation, the respondents' data leads to only one conclusion: yes. However, has the Study of the United States Program created linkages and change in all of the countries represented in Summer/Winter Institutes? That cannot be concluded by this study. This case study can only draw conclusions regarding the Romanian participants in the U.S. Studies Program. Further research is required to identify the program's broader global impact.

To request a copy of the full report, please contact the Office of Policy and Evaluation at (202) 619-5307, or evaluations@pd.state.gov or by mail at:

U.S. Department of State
Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
Office of Policy and Evaluation (ECA/P)
State Annex – 44, Room 357
301 4th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20547

Chapter One

Introduction

Background

The United States Information Agency (USIA), known as the United States Information Service (USIS) overseas, is an independent foreign affairs agency of the United States government. The Office of Policy and Evaluation (E/Z) provide policy analysis and guidance, coordination, and evaluation of the activities and programs within USIA. The Study of the United States Summer/Winter Institutes is an evaluation conducted by E/Z during fiscal year 1999. The independent contractor on this study is Kais E. Systems, Incorporated of Burke, Virginia.

Statement of the Objective

The purpose of the Study of the United States Summer/Winter Institutes is to evaluate the impact of the Summer/Winter Institute experience on foreign scholar participants. The evaluation of the Summer/Winter Institutes seeks to determine what effect, if any, that participation in Summer/Winter Institute programs may have had on scholars vis a vis changes in their behavior and activities within their home institutions, their local, state and/or national communities, and/or with regard to the international community. The two basic questions answered in this study were: 1) Has a multiplier effect been created?, and 2) If so, what type of changes and or linkages were effected?

01 states:

The main objective of the institute is to enhance and deepen the participants' understanding of the United States so as, ultimately, to improve the quality of teaching about the United States in their home countries and institutions. As American Literature is examined, broader themes associated with the U.S. experience and U.S. civilization should be incorporated into the program. The Agency intends to facilitate a "multiplier effect," e.g. a transfer of the knowledge gains at the Winter Institute to other educators in the home countries and institutions of the participants.

Romania

Romania is a mid-size country of 238,391 km², situated in Central Europe.

Geographically, Romania is made of hills, plateaus and plains concentrically placed around the Carpathian Mountains. Romania is located on the middle and lower Danube and has a 244 km shoreline along the Black Sea. The population of Romania is about 23 million. Most of its citizens are ethnic Romanians (89.4 percent), while representative minorities are the Hungarians, the Germans and Gypsies.

Romania was a constitutional monarchy based on the model of western monarchies until 1948 when the communist regime took over power. The political and economic systems were liberal during the monarchy. Democratic political institutions and European legislation are the very roots of Romania civilization.

The Soviet occupation during World War II lead to the establishment of the communist regime in 1948. It dissolved the democratic political institutions and seriously harmed individual freedoms and ownership rights. After the communist regime was overthrown in 1989, Romania underwent deep social, political and economic

changes. Romania returned to its traditional democratic values and synchronized itself with the western European ones.

Romania is now a Republic, according to the Constitution of November 21, 1991, with a two-chamber Parliament elected for a 4-year term. The President is elected by universal vote for two 4-year terms at most. The President of Romania, since November 28, 1996, is Emil Constantinescu.

Romania has diplomatic relations with 176 states and is a member of the United Nations and numerous other international organizations.

Romanian Summer/Winter Institute Participants

Romania has had thirteen participants in Summer/Winter Institutes since 1990. Participants who attended the Summer/Winter Institutes since 1990 were invited to participate in this study. The names of the participants, their institute, and their field of study are provided in Table One. For the purposes of this study, the term “Summer Institute” will be used to mean Summer Institute and Winter Institute.

CHAPTER ONE SUMMARY

- The purpose of the Study of the United States Summer/Winter Institutes is to evaluate the impact of the Institute experience on foreign scholar participants.
- The study was conducted in Romania during June 1999 and was sponsored by the United States Information Agency.
- Romania has had 13 participants in Institutes since 1990.

Chapter Two

Methodology

Kais E Systems, Incorporated was selected as the contractor to conduct the evaluation of the impact of USIA Study of the United States Summer Institutes. Shelley Kais served as the senior evaluator and James Kais served as the conference and administrative coordinator for Kais E Systems. Erik Anderson is the USIA Evaluation Officer for this study. Kais E Systems and Erik Anderson began an in-depth analysis of the secondary data associated with the Summer/Winter Institutes Program in October 1998. Secondary internal data was provided by the E/AES staff to assist the study team in designing the scope of the study and the questions to be used in the survey instruments and interviews. The study team reviewed secondary external data to develop a clearer understanding of the political environment, educational system, and demographics of Romania.

The study design for this evaluation was a case study. As a research strategy, the case study is used in many situations, including:

1. Policy, political science, and public administration research
2. Community psychology and sociology
3. Organizational and management studies

It was determined to be more cost-effective and efficient to send the study team to Romania and arrange for the institute participants to travel to a central location rather than to bring the participants to the United States or to attempt to collect the data via telephone, postal mail, or e-mail. The location that was chosen for the conference was

Bucharest. Bucharest is the capital of the country and also the location of the United States Information Service (USIS) country office. The USIS office assisted the study team in the administrative details of the conference. Ms. Rodica Rodu and Ms. Carmen Fecioru served as the primary points of contact during the planning phase of the project.

The thirteen participants from Romania of the Summer/Winter Institutes received an invitation letter to attend a one-day focus group session at the USIS office in Bucharest. The USIS staff in Bucharest sent the invitation letter. Transportation, meals and lodging were provided for the participants. Eight of the thirteen respondents were able to attend the conference.

Qualitative and quantitative data were collected on four organizational levels associated with the U.S. Summer/Winter Institute program. Qualitative data was collected during interviews with the institute alumni (level one), the host institute directors (level two), the program coordinators at USIS (level three), and the U.S. Study Program Director at USIA (level four). Quantitative data was collected through survey instruments with the institute directors and the institute alumni. Additionally, qualitative data was collected in two focus group sessions conducted on June 22, 1999. The data collected was analyzed to determine if there is a multiplier-effect and what changes or linkages have been made as a result of attending a Summer/Winter Institute.

Survey

A self-administered survey was given to the Summer/Winter Institute alumni by the study team on June 22, 1999, in Romania. The six-page survey requested background information on the summer institute attended, current employment position, promotions received since attending the institute, seminars/training sessions/lectures given, articles

written, and continued contact with other participants in the summer institute.

Subsequent questions of the survey document asked the participants to rate their academic experiences at the institute, their cultural experiences, and finally an overall assessment of the institute. The respondents were asked to rate the curriculum of the institute by indicating whether they thought lectures and/or presentations should have less emphasis, no change, more emphasis or should be discontinued. The eight participants who attended the conference in Bucharest were administered the survey as a group; the other five Summer/Winter Institute alumni were mailed a survey with a return stamped envelope. The fifteen-question survey is included in this report as Appendix B.

Interviews with Participants

Each of the eight participants who attended the conference in Bucharest was interviewed individually. Erik Anderson and Shelley Kais conducted the interviews jointly. The interviews averaged one hour in length. Each of the interviews was conducted in a private location and offered the participant an opportunity to speak openly and honestly about their experience in their Summer/Winter Institute.

Of the five participants who were unable to attend the conference, attempts were made to contact four of them by telephone for an interview. The fifth individual has moved out of the country and it was not possible to contact her by telephone.

The interviews began with a validation of the summer institute, year, and field of study. The primary focus of the interviews was the summer institute experience. Of primary interest to the evaluators was the most significant aspect of their experience, specific areas of knowledge that have been applied since their return to their home country, and new understandings of the United States or American values. The post

summer institute experience attempted to identify any changes, new approaches, practices, or policies that had been implemented in their teaching as well as the relationship between the USIS post and the alumni. The interview also included discussion about contact with, or their return to, the United States since their institute experience. The interview concluded with a discussion of their most significant accomplishment since their return from their summer institute. The interview guide is included as Appendix C.

Interviews with Host Institutes

Interviews were conducted during June and July 1999 with the Directors of the Summer/Winter Institutes or their designated representatives. The interviews were conducted by telephone by Shelley Kais and James Kais. The interview guide is included in this report as Appendix D. The purpose of the interview was to ascertain the institution's perception of the knowledge and skills of the participants, and how they would describe the participants' perceptions of certain aspects of the program. We did not ask that the interviewee focus on just Romanian participants in their institutions, but rather a general overview of the participants. Interviews were given rating scales of one (1) to five (5) with five (5) as excellent, one (1) as poor. During the telephone interview they were also asked to discuss subjects/topics/lectures that were offered during the institute and determine if less emphasis, no change, more emphasis, or discontinuing that portion of the curriculum should be considered. The interviewee was also given a Likert scale of "strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no opinion" to assess several characteristics of the program such as the length of the program, the field trip portion, and the reputation of USIA/E/AES programs. The concluding questions allowed the

interviewee the opportunity to tell us how they would rate the Summer/Winter Institute alumni program, the participants' commitment to academic excellence, leadership skills of the participants, and the success of the institute.

A secondary purpose of the telephone interviews is to allow the evaluators to compare the responses from the host institute to the responses from the participants. The survey documents were designed to provide the evaluators with an opportunity to determine the correlation of the perceptions of the participants and the perceptions of the host institutes.

Table One
Summer/Winter Institutes
with Romanian Scholars

Host Institute	Subject	Year(s)
University of California, Los Angeles	American Literature	1993, 1995
University of California, Santa Barbara	American Literature	1996, 1997
University of Illinois at Chicago	Study of Secondary School Educators	1995, 1996
Lafayette College	American Federalism	1998
	U. S. Political System	1998
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	U.S. Political System	1997
University of Michigan	U.S. Foreign Policy	1998
Oklahoma State	U.S. Economy	1996
University of Delaware	American Literature	1997
New School, New York	Institute for Foreign Policy Officials	1998

Focus Groups

Two focus group sessions were conducted on June 22, 1999, at the United States Information Service facility in Bucharest, Romania. Shelley Kais moderated the session. Eight of the thirteen Summer/Winter Institute participants attended the focus group

session. Erik Anderson and James Kais observed the sessions. Additionally, a tape recorder was used to record the sessions.

The focus group questions are attached as Appendix E. The purpose of the morning focus group session was to discuss the summer institute experience. The participants were asked to discuss issues such as

{*****

*****hip that the
participants had with the institute, faculty mentors, institute administration, colleges, and
other people whom they met during their stay in the United States.

Interview with USIS Staff

Interviews were conducted with Rodica Rodu and Carmen Fecioru on June 24, 1999. The purpose of the interviews was to gain a clearer understanding of the process of selection of the Summer/Winter Institute participants, the follow-up with the participants upon their return, and the activities of the participants as a group of “graduates” when they return. Each of the interviews was approximately one hour in length.

CHAPTER TWO SUMMARY

- Kais E Systems, Incorporated conducted the evaluation of the impact of the USIA study of the United States Summer Institutes.
- Surveys, interviews, and focus groups were the primary data collection techniques.
- Interviews were conducted in Bucharest, Romania, on June 22, 1999.
- Host institute telephone surveys were conducted during June and July 1999.
- Focus groups were attended by eight of thirteen institute participants.
- The USIS staff was interviewed on June 24, 1999.

Chapter Three

Data Analysis

Participant Survey

This section of the report addresses the participant surveys and the analysis of the results. Two surveys were conducted; one of the participants and one of the host institutes. The response rate for the participant survey was approximately 77% (10 of 13 respondents). The survey instrument addressed four areas: (1) background information, (2) academic experience at the summer institute, (3) cultural experience at the summer institute, and (4) and overall assessment of the summer institute.

Background Information

Of the ten respondents, four indicated that they had been promoted since their attending a summer institute. All of the four respondents who were promoted believe that their attendance and knowledge gained during the summer institute played an important role in their promotions. Seventy percent of those who responded have been asked to conduct seminars, training sessions, or lectures outside of their normal teaching activities. The respondents also indicated that the presentations that they made were the result of scholarly research that was conducted while in the United States. Some of the topics, which were presented through seminars, training, and lecture, include American Culture and Civilization, American Literature workshops, and American art. Noteworthy are the books, journal articles, poems, and curriculum that have been developed and published since attendance at the United States Summer Institutes. Sixty percent of the respondents, or six of the ten have published since their return to their home country. A partial list of

publications is included in this report. The summer institute experience does not appear to end for the participants when the institute is over. Sixty-seven percent of the participants have remained in touch with class members. Of that 67%, more than a significant portion believes that these relationships established through the Summer/Winter Institutes have assisted them professionally. The survey data indicated that the respondents placed a great deal of value on their summer institute experience. The value does not lie only with the scholarly research, but also with the relationships established with other class participants. The participants believe that this experience has contributed to their professional growth and development.

Academic Experiences: Summer Institute

Using a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being “excellent” and 1 being “poor”, the respondents were asked to rate several abilities, skills, and qualifications. A summary table of the questions and a mean score of their responses is shown below.

Table Two
Question 9 – Alumni Survey
Romania

Question	Mean Score
Interaction with participants	4.9
Discuss issues and exchange ideas	4.8
Comprehension of the English language	4.8
Comprehend faculty lecturers	4.7
Ability to write English	4.7
Function at the expected academic level	4.7
Professional Qualifications	4.6
Ability to speak English	4.6
Academic qualifications	4.2
Use the library for research purposes	4.0
Use the computer	2.7

The data suggests that the participants were comfortable with their qualifications to participate in the institute both with their ability to read, write, and speak English, but also to participate with other members of the class. However, a significant drop in the mean score was evident both for the use of the library for research and the use of computers. The introductory section of this report describes Romania and some of the changes that it has experienced in the past ten years and this may attribute to the participants rating of these two items so significantly lower than the others. The computer and the vast library resources, which were provided to them while in the United States, were much more than they had experienced in their home country.

Participants were also asked to list and evaluate the topics of their institute. They were asked to evaluate the topics as to whether less emphasis, no change, more emphasis, or discontinue the topic. Generally, the participants believed that the amount of emphasis was appropriate for the topics of the institute.

The respondents were asked to identify the most successful method of learning at their summer institute and why. Most respondents (78%) believed that the interactive discussions provided them with the greatest learning experience. Lectures and individual projects were also cited as excellent methodologies for the summer institute participants. Generally, the respondents were extremely satisfied with the topics at the institute and the methods of teaching used by the mentors.

Cultural Experiences: Summer Institute

The Summer/Winter Institute provides the participant with the opportunity to visit various sites within the United States as selected by the institute. The participants all indicated in the surveys that the cultural experience was undeniably one of the most

profound experiences in their lives. In an attempt to assess the impact of the cultural experience on the participants, a variable clustering question was asked:

How would you rate the following list of activities/training while attending your institute? We will use a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being “excellent” and 1 being “poor”.

Using variable clustering, the respondents were asked to rate several items based on their field experience during their institute. The overall assessment of the field experience was very positive with the respondents’ average ratings above 4.0. Faculty mentoring and access to Internet/e-mail did not receive ratings above 4.0, and were the lowest rated items of the activities/training experienced while attending their institutes. Based on the ten respondents, the following mean scores were calculated:

Table Three
Question 12 – Alumni Survey
Romania

Question	Mean Response
Personal interactions with other class members	4.9
General understanding of the institute theme	4.9
Site visits	4.8
Administrative arrangements	4.8
Personal interaction with members of the American community	4.7
Lecture program	4.5
Interactive discussions with other students	4.5
Access to scholarly resources	4.5
Individual research	4.4
Individual projects	4.3
Cultural activities	4.2
Acquisition or purchase of books/references	4.1
Faculty mentoring	3.8
Access to Internet/e-mail account	3.7

Several respondents wrote in statements that they wanted to comment on regarding the cultural experience of the summer institute. One respondent was dissatisfied with “encouragement to stay longer.” The respondent indicated that she was not encouraged to stay in the United States longer at her own expense. She ranked this “1” on the questionnaire. Another respondent indicated that the “home hospitality” provided during their stay was excellent. “Excellent academics involved” was also noted in this section of the survey. Overall, the respondents indicated that the cultural experience portion of the summer institute was very good to excellent.

To develop a better understanding of the overall assessment of the summer institute, the respondents were given a series of statements to which they were asked to respond using a Likert scale rating STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, STRONGLY DISAGREE, or NO OPINION. Again, the overall satisfaction of the respondents was very high. The raw data is presented in the following table:

Table Four
Question 13 – Alumni Survey
Romania

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The length of the institute is sufficient	2	4	4		
The academic portion of the institute is sufficient	4	4	2		
The field trip portion of the institute is sufficient	4	5	1		
The lectures/seminars/discussions met my expectations	4	5	1		
The USIA/E/AES program is well known as an excellent opportunity for studies of the United States.	10				
The USIA/E/AES program is well-respected as an excellent opportunity for the studies of the United States	10				
I would recommend participation in a USIA/E/AES student program to my colleagues.	10				
The institute stimulated critical analysis and allowed different points of view.	7	3			
Most of my fellow students returned to their country and developed or refined their courses and course materials.	6	3			1
A valuable and long-term benefit of the Summer Institute is my broader perspective of the United States.	8	1			1
A valuable and long-term benefit of the Summer Institute is the development of a personal network of friends and contacts in other countries.	5	4		1	
A valuable and long-term benefit of the Summer Institute is the development of a personal network of friends and contacts in the United States.	3	4	1	1	1
A valuable and long-term benefit of the Summer Institute is my understanding of American values and society.	10				
A valuable and long-term benefit of the Summer Institute is the research and resources gathered on the individual project.	6	3	1		

The statements used in this question were designed to test the multiplier effect of the program. A significant finding of this question was the 100% STRONGLY AGREE response to questions regarding the USIA/E/AES program and the long-term benefit that the respondents believe that the program has on their lives. Without deviation, the respondents believe that the program is excellent and the program has the multiplier effect that the study was designed to measure. This multiplier effect can only be attributed to Romania, as it was the case study country.

A significant finding of this group of statements is the variance between the two statements regarding the personal network of friends and contacts. The data indicates that the respondents believe that they have established a network with their classmates from other countries more than they have established a network within the United States. This finding leads to the next question regarding the interaction between the faculty mentor and the summer institute participant.

The participants were asked to rate the interaction between the participant and the faculty mentor using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being “Excellent” and 1 being “Poor”. The respondents rated their contact with the institute since they completed their program with a mean score of 3.6. This score is very close to the score regarding the faculty mentoring that was asked previously in the alumni questionnaire. The institute received a mean response of 4.8 in meeting the goals and objectives of the institute. The respondents indicated that their leadership skills demonstrated during their summer institute were very good with a mean response of 4.1, while they indicated that their commitment to academic excellence in their home country had a modal response of excellent.

The concluding question of the questionnaire provided the respondent with an opportunity to discuss any issues regarding the effectiveness of the USIA Summer Institutes. Most respondents took this opportunity to thank the United States Information Agency, the United States Information Service, and their host institutes for the “life-changing” experience of studying in the United States. Several respondents indicated that they believe that the lack of an “in-country” alumni association to share the experiences of the institute as well as the scholarly research and resources was a weakness. Following are some comments as quoted from the questionnaires.

Respondent A:

“In my opinion, what the institute lacks, is a direct contact of the participants with the ordinary American citizen, that is, if possible, to permit the participants to (probably) live in an American family or even work in his/her own division for some time.

Secondly, I think that we, the former participants could be better used here at home. We are all willing to continue doing something in this respect, but, at the same time, I feel people don’t want our assistance.”

Respondent B:

“It’s a pity there was not much follow-up of the Summer Institute in the country. Some of the participants (I, at least) would have been glad to participate in USIS-organized activities in the country (or abroad). Our experience (and expertise) could have been used in—maybe—joint programs of USIS and the Ministry of Education or in other programs (much as designing and publishing teaching materials on American Studies) that the USIS post in Romania could have initiated.

It was a marvelous experience, but steps could have been taken to enhance its effectiveness by providing some in-country opportunities to get it used and multiplied.”

Respondent C:

“I would strongly support the idea of funding, continuing and developing American Studies in Romania, since such a complex experience would be beneficial for young Romanian intellectuals as well as for the American “mind” of the 21st century.

American presidents have provided their audiences with effective slogans not only to win elections, but also to follow grand projects. The beginning of this century witnessed the outstanding contribution of Woodrow Wilson, in 1961 President Kennedy declared “Ich bin ein Berliner”, and now, we may ask ourselves is the myth of the “frontier” (a cultural one) still echoing into our minds.

I think, yes, it is.

The global world in which we live has to work out new genuine ways to crossing cultural barriers without pushing the world out to chaos and destruction. As Richard Roety would say, one the basis of our “contingency” we need more “human solidarity”.

American Studies could still provide the impetus for such a necessary achievement.”

Respondent D:

“You must give us to the eastern academic staff source more opportunities. Our strange situation is that we, the middle ages, were sacrificed in the Communist time and we are also, because the real opportunities leave only the young people and the very young but we have the administrative power and the academic responsibilities for courses and the power to promote people. The result is blockage of the progress, a generation conflict and simply the system doesn’t work well.

I suggest as political scientists to be more careful with eastern and southern post-communist Europe. It would be much cheaper for you to help us financially, with expertise, to try to keep the ethnic balance than to pay for wars and troubles. A marshal plan is needed badly.

Another suggestion where you have programs in our country, please make a balance, needed balance between Romanian and Hungarian, this is very important and also keep the American standards and not throw down and let the Romanians to do what and how they want with American public money.”

Respondent E:

“The most useful thing I brought from the summer institute is a broader perspective and a more flexible approach to American literature, as well as rich information. It practically changed my global vision of things.

The way in which the summer institute was organized (in modules, each of which could be extended and transformed into a whole course) was very

intelligent. In this way the information we received is applicable in a large variety of cases. This is very useful. We can teach a variety of courses by using and applying the information we received.

One of the most precious things I received was trust in myself and initiative and the belief that many things are possible and that many things can be done.”

Respondent F:

“The program in which I took part was invaluable in improving my knowledge about the U.S. political system. After this experience, I think no other training session or workshop could compare with the almost total immersion I along with my colleagues underwent in this six-weeks program. I found useful the academic and non-academic content of the summer institute, the methodologies, the teaching techniques and the curriculum materials provided during the course.”

Interviews with Participants

Interviews were conducted with the participants on June 22-26.

Shelley Kais and Erik Anderson conducted the interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to probe for detailed information regarding their summer institute experience, their post summer institute experience, and U.S. and international relationships and networks the participants established as a result of their institute.

As a background question, the respondent was asked to discuss how they found out that they had been selected to attend the Summer/Winter Institute. There did not appear to be a standard application and selection process of which the participants were aware. Several participants indicated that they had been asked to apply through their university or a teacher center. A couple of the participants were asked to apply and meet an application deadline of the following day. They had to request extensions. One individual indicated that he was not able to get to Bucharest for the interview process and was interviewed over the telephone. It is important to note that none of the participants were particularly surprised by this application and selection process and did not indicate any concern about the process at this time.

Only one of the interviewees had ever been to the United States prior to attending their institute. However, during this question in the interview process two of the interviewees indicated that they had studied in Great Britain; one had studied in Great Britain multiple times. The interviewers took this opportunity to question the interviewees more thoroughly on the question of study in other countries. Several of the participants commented that Great Britain offers a

number of academic opportunities for U.S. studies, and further indicated that France was increasing their presence in Romania as an academic center also. During this discussion, the interviewees also commented on the decreased presence of the United States in Romania. The relocation of the American library from Bucharest was mentioned several times during the interview and focus group sessions.

The interviewees were asked to discuss the most significant aspect of their summer institute experience. Several comments are listed below:

- The impact of America and being in a multi-national group
- Experience of a lifetime; had been telling students lies about America from textbooks and now could tell them the reality of America.
- The greatness/hugeness of America in all directions; human capacity of the Americans to understand each other; tolerance.
- Diversity. People getting along so well together.
- Finding out what cultural studies really means. Understanding ethnic literature. Going to church and seeing the free religious manifestation of the black and white people.
- Access to resources that were not available. Was able to complete the doctoral dissertation. Realized that the teaching and studying of literature in Romania was out of date. In Romania they believed that the African American, Chicano, and women writers were just a “whim.” .

The accomplishments of the summer institute attendees are many. Much of what they have accomplished they attribute to their study in the United States. Some specific areas

of knowledge that have been applied to academic studies since the interviewees returned from the United States are:

Wrote and integrated a chapter on Native American literature into classes

Published an American Literature textbook for third year students

Reorganized the American Studies department at the university

Ability to discuss American Indians, culture civilization, food and customs in classes

American films, American urbanism, and American visual art

Able to use the mini-cassette series from the institute in his class

None of the interviewees indicated that they experienced any resistance from others to applying their newly learned information.

Several comments were made during the interviews about the values that were learned in the United States. One interviewee commented that he learned efficiency. Most of his life, the concept of efficiency had been blurred and he now sees the importance of efficiency in his professional life. He experienced efficiency first hand at an organization they visited during their field trip. On a personal note, he learned the importance of punctuality. He commented, "In America, when someone tells you they are going to do something, you can count on it." Frankness, openness, and the willingness to help were all traits that one interviewee experienced while in the United States. "Honesty." One interviewee summed up his experience in one word; honesty. Having spent the majority of his life under communist rule, seeing the honesty and the ability to be honest was personally and spiritually emotional for him. One interviewee shed his romantic view of America and accepted his realistic view of America. He commented "America is a rich country, but also a country in which you have to work the

hardest in the world. Most Romanians like the image of the affluent society; they dislike sacrificing their life or their time to get rich.” The overall feeling that the institute participants came home with was that they had a true image of the United States. They would no longer be teaching their classes from outdated books, but rather they were able to share real experiences.

The evaluation of the Summer/Winter Institutes seeks to determine what effect, if any, that participation in Summer/Winter Institute programs may have had on scholars vis a vis changes in their behavior and activities within their home institutions, their local, state and/or national communities, and/or with regard to the international community. To address this in the data collection and analysis phase of this study, questions were asked about the interviewees post summer institute experiences. The following questions were asked during the interview:

1. Have you introduced any changes, new approaches, practices, or policies into your teaching as a result of the summer institute?
2. Have you shared your experience in the U.S. in your home country?
3. Do you maintain contact with other people in your country or region who have attended summer institutes or other similar programs sponsored by the United States?
4. Do you maintain contact with the post?
5. Do you stay in touch with people you met in the U.S.?
6. Have you returned to the United States since your Summer Institute experience?
7. Do you routinely update your knowledge about your summer institute study program?

Several of the participants have published since their return from the United States.

Three of the respondents indicated that one of the most significant changes they had made in their classroom teaching is that they had transitioned to a student-centered teaching concept. The traditional teaching methodology in Romania is that of lecture. These interviewees indicated that the student centered model with debate, student interaction, small group work, and facilitation has been very successful in their classrooms and allowed them to encourage critical thinking among their students, thorough analysis of the works of literature, and overall excitement in the classroom.

The interviewees also discussed ways in which they have been able to share their United States experience with others in Romania. Several of the respondents have participated in symposiums, offered teacher-training sessions, spoken at community groups, and all have shared their experience with family and friends. All of the interviewees indicated that they were eager to share their scholarly resources, new ideas, experiences, and new concepts with anyone who was interested. One interviewee indicated that he brought menus from the United States to Romania and used them in his classroom to talk about America.

Maintaining contact with the host institute, the other institute participants, the summer institute participants from Romania, the USIS, and USIA received little if any positive response. Seven of the eight respondents indicated that they do not have any contact with the USIS post in Romania. The interviewees also indicated that they do not maintain contact with their host institutes. Many of the interviewees indicated that they sent Christmas cards to the other participants in their institute, but for the most part they do not exchange correspondence with other institute participants. Many of the

interviewees met each other for the first time when they met in Bucharest on June 22, 1999. There is no active list of Summer/Winter Institute participants in country. Not one interviewee indicated that they had any contact with the United States Information Agency since their field experience trip to Washington, D.C.

Much of the data collected during the interviews was presented in its original form. Data that was quantifiable, such as seven of the eight interviewees, was presented in that manner to protect the confidentiality of the data.

Interviews with Host Institutes

Seven of nine host institute directors were contacted by telephone. Many of the questions asked during the telephone interviews were similar to the questions on the participant survey. The purpose of asking similar questions to the host institute was to determine if the participants and the host institutes perceptions were the same. For this analysis, the first question to be discussed is as follows:

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being “excellent” and 1 being “poor”, please respond to the following questions regarding the majority of the participants at your most recent summer institute.

The following table shows the mean score for the participants and the mean score for the host institute.

Table Five
Question 5 – Host Institute Telephone Survey
Romania

Question	Mean Score Participant	Mean Score Host Institute
Interaction with participants	4.9	4.3
Comprehension of the English language	4.8	3.8
Discuss issues and exchange ideas	4.8	4.2
Ability to write English	4.7	3.5
Function at the expected academic level	4.7	3.7
Comprehend faculty lecturers	4.7	3.7
Professional Qualifications	4.6	3.8
Ability to speak English	4.6	4.0
Academic Qualifications	4.2	3.8
Use the library for research purposes	4.0	4.0
Use the computer	2.7	3.0

The host institute directors were asked questions regarding the curriculum of their institute during their most recent summer institute experience. As with the participants, the host institute directors also indicated that they seemed to have come upon a good mix in the curriculum of their programs. Two of the topics: Agriculture Economics and a historical perspective of American Literature were recommended to be discontinued or at least receive less emphasis in the program by the directors. The participants did not indicate any topics that should be discontinued or receive less emphasis.

There does not seem to be any consensus about teaching methods for the institutes. Several approaches were discussed during the interviews. Fifty-seven percent of the directors interviewed believe that the program should consist of at least 50% lecture coupled with 50% discussion or participation. One institute indicated that the program should consist of lecture and field trip. Another director indicated that the best methodology was a variety of techniques: lecture, participation, small groups, field trips, and question/answer sessions.

Another question used to compare the responses of the participants to the responses of the host institutes was:

How would you rate the participants' perceptions of the following list of activities/training while attending your institute? We will use a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being "excellent" and 1 being "poor".

Table Six
Question 8 – Host Institute Telephone Survey
Romania

Question	Mean Response Participant	Mean Response Host Institute
Personal interactions with other class members	4.9	4.6
General understanding of the institute theme	4.9	4.9
Site visits	4.8	4.8
Administrative arrangements	4.8	4.7
Personal interaction with members of the American community	4.7	4.1
Lecture program	4.5	4.4
Interactive discussions with other students	4.5	4.0
Access to scholarly resources	4.5	4.5*
Individual research	4.4	3.8*
Individual projects	4.3	4.0*
Cultural activities	4.2	4.6
Acquisition or purchase of books/references	4.1	4.8
Faculty mentoring	3.8	3.8*
Access to Internet/e-mail account	3.7	4.4

*This was not applicable to the New School, NY.

Another question used to assess what changes or linkages have been made as a result of the United States Summer Institute was:

...A series of statements to which the response will be either STRONGLY AGREE, AGREE, DISAGREE, STRONGLY DISAGREE, or NO OPINION.

The statements and the raw data responses are shown in the table below:

Table Seven
Question Nine – Host Institute Telephone Survey
Romania

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
The length of the institute is sufficient	2	5			
The academic portion of the institute is sufficient	3	4			
The field trip portion of the institute is sufficient	1	5	1		
The lectures/seminars/discussions meet the participants' expectations	2	4	1		
The USIA/E/AES program is well known as an excellent opportunity for studies of the United States.	3	2	1		1
The USIA/E/AES program is well-respected as an excellent opportunity for the studies of the United States	4	2	1		
I would recommend participation in a USIA/E/AES study program to my colleagues.	4	3			
I would recommend participation in a USIA/E/AES study program to a foreign colleague.	5	2			
Your institute stimulates critical analysis and allowed different points of view.	4	3			
Most students returned to their country and developed or refined their courses and course materials.	4	2			1

The most significant change in the data between the participants and the host institute is in the statements regarding the perceptions of the USIA/E/AES program as an opportunity for study. The participants, without exception, believe that the United States

Summer Institute program is an excellent, well-known and well-respected opportunity for study. The host institute data did not correlate as closely in these statements.

The last rating question asked of the host institute regards the alumni program at their host institute, participant's leadership skills, and the institute's success in meeting the project objectives, goals and implementation during the most recent summer institute.

Table Eight
Question 10 – Host Institute Telephone Survey
Romania

Statement	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1
How would you rate your contact with the institute's summer program alumni?	1	1	3	1	1
How would you rate the alumni program at the summer institute?	1	1	2	2	1
*How would you rate the participants' commitment to academic excellence in their home country?	3	3			
How would you rate the leadership skills that the institute participants exhibit during their United States experience?	1	4	2		
How successful would you rate your institution in meeting the project objectives, goals, and implementation during your most recent summer institute?	5	2			

*One respondent indicated they had no opinion on this question.

The final question in the host institute telephone survey was an open-ended question providing the institute director with the opportunity to discuss any issues regarding the effectiveness of the USIA Summer Institutes. Five of the seven directors indicated that there needed to be better follow up with the participants after they completed the program. Another respondent indicated that the administrative support funding was not sufficient for the requirements of the program. One director also

indicated that the match of the participant with their program of study was inadequate. The result of this is that the participants are not interested in the program and often their focus is more on being in the United States than participating in a program of study.

Focus Groups

Two focus groups were conducted on June 22, 1999 at the USIS facility in Bucharest. Eight Summer Institute participants were present. The purpose of the morning focus group session was to identify the impact of the summer institute experience. The focus group sessions were taped. Erik Anderson and James Kais observed the sessions. Each of the participants was actively involved in the focus group sessions. Rodica Rodu and Carmen Fedoricu introduced the focus group session. The participants were given the opportunity to discuss the application and selection process for summer institute participation. Tracey Parker, past Cultural Affairs Officer, was praised for her excellence in program administration and implementation. Each of the participant's application and selection appeared to be a unique experience. There was no standardized process by which a scholar could apply for admission to a summer/winter institute. The invitation to apply came through either a University Department Chairperson or Ms. Rodu to the potential candidate. This was further substantiated during the interviews with the participants.

Arrival in the United States was an exciting day for each of the participants. They discussed the arrangements that they were provided in the United States and indicated that in all cases they were very happy with their living quarters, their field trips, meals, and common group activities. One alumnus indicated that she would have preferred more time with an American family.

The experience had a profound impact on each participant both professionally and personally. Two participants indicated that they were able to complete their doctoral dissertations through the access they had to the scholarly resources that were available to them. Several participants discussed their publications that they were able to research while in the United States. Two participants indicated that the field trip was an exceptional opportunity which they believe they will never again have the chance to experience. One participant told of how he cried during the visit to the home of Faulkner; a dream he never thought would ever come true.

All the participants indicated that they had “grown up” with the lecture method of education, and in many cases had used that as their primary method of teaching. The summer institute provided them with several different teaching methodologies and techniques for learning, which they have implemented in their classes in Romania. There was a great deal of discussion during the focus group session about the different teaching methodologies: small group, question/answer sessions, debates, lectures, student presentations, and interactive, student-centered learning. Several comments were made regarding the professional and personal service that the host institutes provided to the participants. Several directors’ names were acknowledged as being impetuses for life-changing experiences.

The field trip experience provided insight into the vastness of America that most participants did not anticipate and at times could not grasp. One participant discussed her travels in the Southwest and the visits to the Native American reservations. Another participant was able to translate her experience in the Southwest into a published chapter in an American Literature text on Native American Literature. Several

participants did indicate that by the time they arrived in Washington, D.C., funds were tight.

The most difficult question for the participants was the question regarding what was the least important aspect of the summer institute experience for them professionally. The initial response was none. However, this yielded a discussion on the acquisition of materials and the funds available for those purchases. Although this was not the least important aspect of the experience, it was probably the one they least wanted to discuss.

The afternoon session of the focus group centered more on the post-summer institute experience. The discussions centered around the opportunity for scholarly research, the opportunity to interact with other professional educators from all over the world, seeing the United States and traveling throughout the country, and receiving the funds to acquire reference books and resources which they may not otherwise have been able to purchase.

Focus group participants shared their experiences offering student centered learning experiences within their classroom. One professor discussed that she had used a debate as an exam. During this discussion, there was a question as to why the American library had been moved out of Bucharest. This created a debate of the advantages and disadvantages of the centralized location of the American library resources.

The afternoon session served as validation of data collected during the interviews and the survey regarding the post-summer institute experience. The afternoon session gave the participants a chance to explain any research which they have conducted since their return as well as share copies of the publications with their colleagues, as well

as the USIA staff and contractors. During this discussion it was also noted that several of the U.S. institute participants had also been involved with institutes in Great Britain. Some participants also discussed having worked on curriculum through a program sponsored by Great Britain. This session also brought forward the strong presence that France is building in Romania. France is adding to their cultural centers and increasing opportunities for scholarly research for Romanian academics. The consensus of the group was that while it appeared that France and Great Britain were increasing their presence in Romania, the United States appeared to be reducing their presence.

As the afternoon session began to draw down, the facilitator introduced the question regarding continuing relationships with the institute, faculty mentors, institute administration, and other participants at the summer institute. The discussion served to do two things; it provided information for this study, and it validated the participant's feelings that they were not unique in not having been in touch with their summer institute contacts. The focus group participants shared their failed attempts at maintaining contacts after returning to Romania. During this session, the discussion that the participants did not even know the people from Romania who had attended summer institutes lead to a request by the participants for some type of in-country alumni association. The benefits that an alumni association such as this could provide to the future attendees of summer institutes were discussed. Also during this session, several of the participants discussed that they had been told that they were "old" and that the summer institute participants of the future would be "young." The participants claimed they were told this by a USIS employee, and they felt that this was not a fair criterion to use for the application and selection process of the summer institutes.

CHAPTER THREE SUMMARY

- The response rate of the participants surveyed was 77 percent.
- Of the ten respondents, five indicated that they had been promoted since attending the Institute.
- Seventy percent of the respondents conducted training outside their normal teaching assignment.
- Sixty percent of the respondents have published since their return to their home country.
- Generally, the participants believe they had the necessary abilities, skills, and qualifications to successfully participate in an Institute program.
- The participants rated their library research skills and their computer skills as average to poor.
- Seventy-eight percent of the respondents believe that interactive discussions provide the most successful learning environment.
- Faculty mentoring received an average rating, which was the lowest rating given regarding Institute activity and interaction.
- Without exception, the respondents indicated that USIA/E/AES is an excellent opportunity for study of the United States.
- Several participants completed their dissertations while attending the Institute or shortly after their return to their home countries.

- Several respondents indicated that they believe that the lack of an “in-country” alumni association is a weakness of the program.
- The participants indicated that they had “grown up” with the lecture method of education. The Summer/Winter Institute provided them with several different teaching methodologies and techniques for learning.
- New teaching methodologies have been implemented in classrooms throughout Romania as a direct result of new teaching techniques learned in Summer/Winter Institutes.
- The alumni believed the United States is reducing their presence in Romania in academic studies.
- France and Great Britain appear to be increasing their presence in Romania in academic studies.

Chapter Four

Summary

The purpose of this study was to answer two questions:

- 1) Has a multiplier effect been created as a result of participation in a summer institute?, and
- 2) If so, what types of changes and/or linkages were effected?

The data was collected to support a technique called data triangulation. Surveys, interviews, and focus groups were used to test for the reliability of the data. The questions were presented in the surveys, asked in a one to one interview, and then presented by a facilitator in two focus group sessions. The reliability, or consistency with which the data were collected supports a high level of accuracy in the data collected. The data presented was the same through the three different instruments. The validity of the study, whether it measures what it was intended to measure, can be demonstrated in the findings of the study. Did we answer the two questions?

Multiplier Effect

One hundred percent of those surveyed, interviewed and participating in the focus group indicated that they presented new information to their students upon their return to Romania. Additionally, 70% of the summer institute participants conducted seminars, training sessions, or lectures outside of their normal teach activities. All those who attended the summer institute indicated that they had shared their experiences with others upon their return to Romania. Another significant finding is that all of the summer

institute participants are still involved in teaching at secondary schools and universities within Romania.

An additional multiplier effect has been created through the publications of textbooks, articles, poems, and books on American literature that have been the result of this USIA sponsored program. The participants also discussed the acquisition of books, periodicals, tapes, and other reference materials in the focus group. Many of the participants indicated that they would not have been able to acquire these materials because they are not available in Romania, and secondly, the salary of a professor does not provide sufficient funds for purchasing materials.

One of the findings of the study was the fact that there is no follow up with the summer institute participants when they return from their summer institute experience. During the host institute telephone interviews, several of the host institute directors indicated that they did not have a follow up system, or an alumni system, within their organization. One institute said they are investigating using a list server to keep in touch with their alumni, as well as to provide an avenue for the alumni to keep in touch with each other. One host institute director recommended that the follow up should be from the USIA. The alumni also indicated that there was some benefit that could be realized through keeping in touch with their colleagues from the summer institute. The summer institute alumni also indicated that the lack of a follow up with the participants in country was a deterrent to the multiplier effect.

Linkages and Changes

Linkages

While the development of institutional linkages is not and has not ever been a formal objective of the Study of the U.S. Summer/Winter Institutes, we did test for its presence since it represents another type of multiplier effect. Although focus group discussion indicated that institutional linkages would provide a positive impact, our observation is that institutional linkages are not present in Romania as a result of the institutes. In testing for linkages, several questions were asked to attempt to demonstrate the link: (1) between institute and participant, (2) between participant and USIS, (3) between participant and colleagues, and finally (4) among in country participants. In testing for these linkages, the surveys, interviews, and focus groups all directed their questions to identify the development of these linkages.

Changes

The most significant changes that were present in the study were individual. Each individual discussed various changes they had made in their curriculum, teaching methodology, personal life, and publications. Due to the lack of linkages, the changes did not manifest themselves as corporate, or academic institutional changes. This is not meant to imply that significant changes have not been realized as a result of the United States Summer Institutes, but rather that they have not realized their maximum potential because it does not translate into corporate changes.

Another change that was found is in technology. The participants indicated in their survey responses that they did not possess the level of computer and research skills they desired. It is significant to note that the participants mean response was lower than

the mean scores of the host institute directors in both of these categories. The change that could be expected is that the participants were introduced to technology and research skills that they may not have otherwise experienced. Most of the participants indicated that they did not have access to e-mail at their colleges or universities.

CHAPTER FOUR SUMMARY

- Without exception, the participants indicated that their students benefit from the research, discussion groups, and seminars they attended while at the Institute.
- Each alumnus indicated a desire to return to the United States to study.
- Sixty percent of the alumni have published since their return to their home country.
- The alumni indicated a need for an in-country alumni association to continue the linkage that was developed as a result of attending an Institute.
- Each alumnus categorized his Institute experience as a life-changing event.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

In conclusion, the United States Summer Institutes have effected changes and linkages in Romania. Additionally, there is a multiplier effect that could be enhanced through the addition of a follow up system through the USIS office in country or the USIA program in Washington, D.C. However, it should be noted that this study is in no way an explanation of the multiplier effect and the linkages and changes effected for the Summer Institute Program. This study is a case study of the program in Romania and addresses the specifics of that country only. To better describe the multiplier effect of the summer institute programs, a cross representation of all countries that send participants to the summer institutes should be conducted.

The Romanian participants realized both personal and professional gains from their study in the United States. To summarize the personal and professional findings of the study of Romania participants in Summer/Winter Institutes, the following table is presented:

Personal	Professional
Romania scholars have experienced that which they teach bringing them closer to the truths which they share with their students.	Romanian students receive more current information in the classroom. Publications as a direct result of U.S. study are available for teaching in Romania.
Increased publications as a direct result of research conducted in the United States.	Student centered teaching was introduced in the Romanian classrooms.
Changes have been made in personal lives of many of the Romanian scholars.	Seminars, training sessions, or lectures on contemporary American values and cultures were presented throughout Romania.
Participants were introduced to technology which they may not yet have had access to in Romania.	Summer/Winter Institute participants continue to teach in Romania's secondary schools and universities.
	Books and articles have been published in Romania using the current research conducted by participants while attending U. S. Institutes.

Appendix A

The United States Information Agency (USIA), known as the United States Information Service (USIS) overseas, is an independent foreign affairs agency of the United States government. USIA supports and administers activities intended to promote the free exchange of ideas and information, and to increase mutual understanding between citizens of the United States and people around the world. The underlying principle on which the agency operates is that accurate and honest mutual perception will favorably influence relations between the United States and other countries. Many educational and cultural exchange programs are funded and administered by USIA/USIS.

The Branch for the Study of the United States (E/AES), part of USIA's Office of Academic Programs, promotes better understanding of the people, society, culture, government, and other institutions of the United States among foreign university and secondary educators, and other relevant USIS post contacts. Program subject areas include American studies, American literature, U.S. history, political science, law, economics, public policy, civic education, or any other field in the humanities or social sciences related to the study of the United States.

The Branch offers a variety of U.S. – based exchange programs for foreign participants, and develops U.S. studies materials abroad. Programs include: six-week summer and winter institutes in fields such as multi-disciplinary American studies, the U.S. political system, U.S. history, U.S. federalism, U.S. society, and American literature; participation of foreign Americanism in U.S. –based meetings of scholarly organizations; and, civics education programs for foreign educators.

The Branch also provides support for conferences, seminars and other educational activities abroad that focus on the United States; U.S. studies curriculum development projects overseas; and regional research centers such as the American Studies Research Center in Hyderabad, India, the Salzburg Seminar, and the John F. Kennedy Library in Berlin, Germany. The Branch produces and distributes a wide variety of U.S. studies materials to USIS offices and libraries in other countries. Materials distributed include Branch-produced titles such as Basic Reading in U.S. Democracy and The American Reader series; collections of significant scholarly books in a wide variety of U.S. studies fields; and U.S. studies bibliographies and syllabi. (USIA, Washington, D.C.)

The Office of Policy and Evaluation (E/Z) was established in 1992 to provide policy analysis and guidance, coordination, and evaluation of the activities and programs of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. E/Z is responsible for advising the Associate Director on conceptual approaches to the Bureau's activities and on the foreign policy direction and content of Bureau programming. It develops the Bureau's performance plan and monitors and advises on activities among Bureau elements to ensure consistency with the plan and U.S. foreign policy. It evaluates the success, strengths and weaknesses of Bureau programs against the performance plan, and prepares annual and periodic reports required by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). It also supports the Cultural Property Advisory Committee, which advises the Director on U.S. efforts to curb illicit trade in artifacts under the 1983 Cultural Property Act.

The Evaluation Staff (E/ZE) coordinates the evaluation of all E Bureau programs and activities. The Evaluation Unit was established in response to recommendations

made by USIA's Inspector General, the Government Accounting Office, and the United States Congress. The objective of E/ZE is to provide an analytical service that is useful in managing and improving the quality and effectiveness of Bureau programs. E/ZE also carries out responsibilities in response to the GPRA.

E/ZE develops evaluation standards, drafts and clears with Bureau management the Bureau's evaluation policy and negotiates an annual evaluation plan with Bureau Office Directors. E/ZE establishes evaluation procedures, provides advice and assistance and organizes evaluation training for all elements of the Bureau. E/ZE also administers the Bureau's central evaluation budget and evaluation travel fund.

The Evaluation Staff coordinates the Bureau's programming strategy for Freedom Support Act (FSA) and Special European Economic Development (SEED) programming, is the official contact point for the Bureau with the office of Eastern European and New Independent States affairs (EEN) and chairs the Bureau's FSA working group.

The impact evaluation of the Study of the United States Summer Institutes was conducted through the Office of Policy and Evaluation.

Appendix B:

Study of the United States Institutes

Alumni Survey - Romania

Appendix C:

Individual Interview Guide

Appendix D:

Study of the United States Institutes:

Host Institute Telephone Survey

Appendix E:

Study of the United States Institutes:

Summer Institute Experience

Post-Summer Institute Experience

Appendix F

Participant's Name	Institute	Field of Study
Felicia Burdescu	UCLA, 1993	American Literature
Liviu Martinescu	UCLA, 1995	American Literature
Irina Chirica	UC Santa Barbara, 1997	American Literature
Teodor Mateoc	UC Santa Barbara, 1996	American Literature
Zoe Maria Ghita	U of Ill. at Chicago, 1996	Sec.School Educators
Octavian Patrascu	U of Ill. at Chicago, 1995	Sec.School Educators
*Ileana Voicu	Lafayette College, 1998	American Federalism
Camil Parvu	Lafayette College, 1998	U.S. Political System
Laurentiu Stegan Scalat	S. Ill. U., Carbondale, 1997	U.S. Political System
Antoanella Iulia Motoc	U. of Michigan, 1998	U.S. Foreign Policy
Catalin Postelnicu	Oklahoma State, 1996	U. S. Economy
Marius Jucan	U. of Delaware, 1997	Winter Institute
Daniel Barbu	New School, N.Y., 1998	Foreign Policy

*Study of the U.S. Branch records indicate that Dr. Voicu attended American Federalism, however Dr. Voicu reports her field of study as Federalism and Democracy.